Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 8, 2005.

Claims 1-25 and 39-70 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 and 39-70. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 11-13, 21-23, 25, 39, 41, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as be anticipated by OrderManager (a collation of prior art describing Order Manager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X)

OrderManager is an internet commerce software that automates sale and procurement transactions up and down the supply chain.

Claim 1 reads as follows:
1.   A system for providing a web site, comprising:
      a plurality of business modules from which a company-user selects a set of business modules;
      wherein each business module provides a respective function;
      wherein each business module is associated with a respective plurality of templates, wherein a set of templates is selectable by a company-user from each respective plurality of templates;
      wherein said templates control the functionality performed by the system and the display of information by the system; and
      wherein said templates are customizable to display graphical elements selected by the company-user.

Claim 1 includes having business modules providing different functions. Each business module is associated with a plurality of templates. A set of templates is selectable by the company user from each of the respective plurality templates.

The OrderManager prior art describes a selection between two different look-and-feels for the OrderManager, but the OrderManager prior art does not indicate that <u>the different templates are associated with individual business modules</u>. For that reason, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Bernando et al., does not show a business module with functions. Bernando et al., only shows the construction of static HTML with a Wizard.   Claims 2-11 are dependent

upon claim 1 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 12 reads as follows:

12. A system for providing a web site, comprising:
a set of business modules selected by a company-user;
wherein each business module provides a respective function;
wherein each business module is capable of performing a plurality of commands related to its function and is customizable to perform a set of those commands selected by the company-user;
wherein each business module is associated with a plurality of generic web pages that are customizable to have a look and feel selected by the company-user.

Claims 12 includes having business modules capable of performing a plurality of commands related to its function, business modules being customizable to perform a set of command selected by the company user. There is no discussion in the OrderManager prior art of customizing business modules to perform a set of commands selected by a company user. The selection of different templates appear only to deal with the look-and-feel for the entire system in the OrderManager prior art rather than the selection of the customization to implement a set of commands selected by a company user, as described in claim 12. As discussed above, Bernando et al., does not show business modules. For these reasons, claim 12 is believed to be allowable. Claims 13-25 are dependent upon claim 12 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims the claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 39 reads as follows:

39. A method for use in a system for providing a web site, comprising:
receiving an end-user request from a web browser by a system that includes a selected set of business modules, where each business module is associated with a respective function and where the functions performed by each business module are selected by a company-user;
processing the end-user request by the system, and invoking, by the system, an appropriate business module to implement the end-user request;
receiving resulting data from the appropriate business module; and
generating a web page including graphical elements selected by the company-user and including at least some of the resulting data for display by the web browser as a response to the end-user request.

In claim 39, the functions performed by each business module are selected by a company user. As discussed above, Bernando et al., does not show business modules. This is not shown,

suggested, or given a motivation for in the OrderManager prior art or any other cited reference. Additionally, the end-user request processed and invoked by the system and an appropriate business module to implement the end-user request is not shown, suggested, or given a motivation for in the OrderManager reference. For these reasons, claim 39 is believed to be allowable. Claims 40-43 are dependent upon claim 39 and are believed to be allowable for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Claim 44 reads as follows:

44.   A method for use with a system for providing a web site, comprising:
       selecting and installing a set of business modules selected from a plurality of business modules, where each business module is associated with a respective function;
       selecting for each business module a set of predefined generic web page templates, where each template is associated with a respective action; and
       customizing each selected template to achieve a selected look and feel.

The combination of selecting and installing the business modules, selecting for each business module the predetermined webpage template and customizing each selected template to achieve a selected look and feel is not shown, suggested, or disclosed in the OrderManager reference. Brenando et al., does not show business modules. Bernando also doesn't show a two step process of selecting an element, such as a business module, and selecting templates for the element. The selection of Bernando et al., is apparently done in a single step. For these reasons claim 44 is believed to be allowable. Claims 45-46 are dependent upon claim 44 and for that reason and because of the additional limitation of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-6, 16-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items W-X), in view of Tech Data (a collection of prior art describing Tech Data's extranet, PTO-892, Item: U-V).

With respect to claims 3-4, and 16-17, the Tech Data reference collection alone or in combination with the OrderManager collection of prior art, does not produce a system of the claimed invention since none of the cited art has a locate module. The different countries listed in the first page of the tech data article "V" does not appear to be a locate module but instead appears to be hand coded versioning of Tech Data's website. The Tech Data reference describes a system where Tech Data can produce a backend for another website. As described in the "U" reference, a Tech Data customer, such as Joe's Computer Store, could use the Tech Data extranet

to create its own website. For example, an end-user could log onto Joe's Computer Store and get information from the Tech Data's database and order computers that are shipped by Tech Data but are privately labeled for Joe's Computer Store. There is no locate module used to identify sales location. Tech Data does not describe a situation where the user goes to a central website and use a locate module to identify a nearby sales location.

For these reasons claims 3-4 and 16-17 are believed to be allowable. Claims 5-6 and 20 are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 12 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claims 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X).

The ability to remove business functionality by removing business modules provides flexibility to the system of the present invention that is not disclosed, suggested or given a motivation for in the cited prior art. For this additional reason, claims 10 and 24 are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManaber cited in PTO-892, Item: W-X). Claims 14-15 are dependent upon independent claim 12 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatenable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X). in view of the Tech Data (a collection of prior art describing Tech Data's extranet PTO-892, Items: U-V).

A second set of business modules provided by a partner as claimed in claims 18 and 19 are not shown, suggested or given a motivation for in the cited references. For this reason claims 18 and 19 are believed to be allowable. Additionally, claims 18 and 19 are dependent upon claims 12 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claims 40, and 42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-892, Items: W-X), in view of Gauthier et al. (PTO-982, Item WW).

The combination of the Gauthier with the OrderManager does not produce the system of the claimed invention for these claims. Claim 40 describes context of objects which are not shown, suggested or given motivation for, by the cited prior art. Claim 42 is dependent upon

independent claim 39 and for that reason and because of additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTO-982, Item: W-X). Claim 43 is dependent upon claim 39 and for that reason is believed to be allowable.

Claims 47-70 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over OrderManager (a collection of prior art describing OrderManager cited in PTE-982, Items: W-X), in view to Tech Data (a collection of prior art describing Tech Data's extranet, PTO-892, Itesm: U-V), further in view of the Business Wire (PTO-892, Item: UU

Claims 47 reads as follows:

47.   A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of one or more modules previously selected from a plurality of modules, where the plurality of modules includes:
an assess module designed to determine the end-user's needs and provide a personalized product recommendation;
a catalog module designed to display and maintain product information;
a build module designed to enable the end-user to interactively assemble products and services specific to the end-user's needs;
a compare module designed to allow the end-user to compare multiple products;
a promote module designed to allow the end-user to view promotional information;
a finance module designed to give a end-user the ability to examine financing scenarios;
a transact module designed to facilitate a sales transaction.

Claim 47 includes an assess module designed to determine the end-users needs and provide a personalized product recommendation. None of the cited references alone or in combination describes such an assess module which determines the end-users needs and provides a personalized product recommendation. The Amazon patents of Jacobi do not have an assess module as claimed. Amazon doesn't determine the end user "needs"; it just creates a recommendation based on data related to other purchases and views. An exemplary manner of determining the users "needs" is to ask the user questions, which is not done in the Amazon system. Claim 47 also includes a finance module designed to give an end-user the ability to examine financing scenarios. This is not the same as the account management payment process described in the OrderManager reference. The ability to examine different financing scenarios can be useful to evaluate different ways to purchase an item such as a car. A client finance

module with the ability to examine different financing scenarios is not described, suggested or given a motivation for in any of the cited references. Claims 48-53 are dependent upon claim 47 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 54 as amended reads as follows:

54.   A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a loyalty module designed to provide relationship building activities with the end-user.

Claim 54 as amended now states that the loyalty module is designed to provide relationship building activities with the end-user. Such a system is not described in the cited prior art. For example, the OrderManager system provides discounts to the resellers but does not focus on the end-user customer.

Claim 55 reads as follows:

55.   A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
a build module;
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a locate module.

None of the cited references describe a locate module. For this reason, claim 55 is believed to be allowable. Claims 56-58 are dependent upon claim 55 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 59 reads as follows:

59.   A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
a assess module;
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a locate module.

Claims 59 includes an assess module and a locate module. None of the cited prior art includes an assess module or a locate module. In one embodiment, an assess module can be used

to determine an end-users needs and provide a personalized produce recommendation and the locate module can be used to identify a sales location. No such assess module and locate module described in the prior art references alone on in combination. Claims 60-61 are dependent upon claim 59 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 62 reads as follows:

62. A system for providing an internet sales environment, comprising:
a web site to interface with an end-user, the web site guiding the end-user through a sales process by utilizing a selected set of modules that includes:
an assess module;
a build module;
a catalog module;
a transact module; and
a locate module.

None of the cited references alone or in combination include an assess module or a locate module. For this reason, claim 62 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 63 reads as follows:

63. A method for conducting e-commerce, comprising:
assessing an end-user's needs;
displaying to the end-user product information;
allowing the end-user to assemble customized products;
allowing the end-user to compare a plurality of products;
displaying to the end-user promotion information;
displaying to the end-user financing information;
locating a sales location based on information provided by the end-user; and
forwarding information to the sales location identifying the end-user and any products selected by the end-user in order to complete a sales transaction.

The steps of assessing an end-user's needs, locating a sales location based upon information provided by the end-user and forwarding the information to a sales location identifying the end-user and any products selected by the end-users in order to complete a sales transaction are not shown, suggested or given a motivation for, in any of the cited references. Claims 64-65 are dependent upon claim 63 and for that reason are believed to be allowable.

Claim 66 reads as follows:

66. A computer readable medium have a set of instructions stored therein which when executed by a computer causes the computer to provide an on-line sales environment by performing the following steps in response to respective on-line end-user requests:
assessing an end-user's needs;
displaying to the end-user product and service information;

allowing the end-user to assemble customized products;
allowing the end-user to compare a plurality of products;
displaying to the end-user promotion information;
displaying to the end-user financing information;
locating a sales location based on information provided by the end-user; and
forwarding information to the sales location identifying the end-user and any products
selected by the end-user in order to complete a sales transaction.

As cited above with respect to claims 63, none of the cited references include the assessing, locating and forwarding steps of this claims. For this reason, this claim 66 is believed to be allowable. Claims 67 and 68 are dependent upon claim 66 and for that reason and because of the additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 69 includes pages for accessing an end-user's needs and pages for displaying a sales location based upon information provided by the end-user. Such a system is not shown, suggested or given motivation for by the cited references. For this reason claim 69 is believed to be allowable.

Similarly claim 70 reads as follows:

70. A method for use by a system that includes a display, comprising:
displaying a page for use in assessing an end-user's needs;
displaying a page with product and service information;
displaying a page for use in assembling customized products;
displaying a page for use in to comparing a plurality of products;
displaying a page with promotion information;
displaying a page with financing information;
displaying a page with a sales location based on information provided by the end-user;
and
displaying a page for use in completing a sales transaction.

Claim 70 similar to claim 69 includes a step of displaying a page for assessing an end-user's needs and displaying a page with sales locations based on information provided by the end-user. Such steps are not shown, suggested or given a motivation for in any of the cited references.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/8/05

By: _____
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800